

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	5500	COUNTY	Tulare
APPLICANT	Self Help Enterprises, Inc.	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$150,000
PROJECT TITLE	Tulare County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$187,500

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Extend water collaborative efforts by identifying additional stakeholders, establish a water forum to further understand the water issues, needs, and projects and develop an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score: 6**

**Comment:** The proposal provides a one-page work plan listing nine work items, a summary budget, and a generic two-year schedule. The work items provide no indication that any of the groups proposed to meet the water collaborative have committed to participate in the program. The budget seems to be consistent with the work items and includes hours, rates, and estimated costs for the consultant and administrator, but seems under budget for the entire County plus public workshops. There was no defined performance period nor was one discussed in the work plan. The work plan did not adequately address how the IRWMP would be adopted and did not define who would benefit from the IRWMP or use the IRWMP.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 1**

**Comment:** The applicant describes the region as Tulare County. The discussion of region does not include internal and external boundaries; land use divisions; ecological processes; and environmental, social, and cultural resources. This discussion fails to provide detailed information about the region and why this is a critical area in need of managing water resources. Minimal information about the water resources is included but quantity or quality of those resources is not defined. There is some information included in the work plan regarding the economic conditions of the region, but it is not supported by any information like the social and cultural makeup of the regional community. Proposal does not define the cultural or social values, and does not define the ecological processes or environmental resources within the region. There are no regional local efforts or implementation projects defined.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 2**

**Comment:** There is no discussion regarding regional planning. The planning objectives listed are generic. There is no plan for implementation of the objectives stated.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 2**

**Comment:** The applicant discusses water related issues, but fails to demonstrate how they are integrated. The proposal does not consider water management strategies.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 2**

**Comment:** The proposal lacks details to demonstrate the applicant's ability to develop and implement an IRWMP. This applicant did not discuss any implementation other than gathering the information from current plans from local agencies, etc. to include in the IRWMP and having discussions with the water collaborative. There is no general schedule for implementation of the IRWMP beyond adoption or a process to determine such a schedule. No institutional structure to ensure project implementation is discussed. There is no mechanism or process in the proposal that allows for monitoring the performance of the IRWMP implementation or changes to the IRWMP.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 2**

**Comment:** Impacts and benefits relating to implementation of the IRWMP are not discussed. CEQA compliance is a line item in the work plan, budget and schedule, but it is not discussed in detail.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 1

**Comment:** There is no discussion relating to data or technical analysis. Applicant does not demonstrate how or why the existing and future water management plans support the proposed IRWMP.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 1

**Comment:** The applicant does not discuss data management. The applicant states that the regional water collaborative would be the hub for water information and data. Water collaborative, stakeholder meetings, and public education are implied mechanisms for dissemination of information. The applicant does not demonstrate how data management will support statewide data needs.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 2

**Comment:** The work plan mentions that local stakeholders will be included but, there is no detail as to the identity of the stakeholders in the region, who will be included in the planning process, how to identify and include additional stakeholders, how they will be involved in the IRWMP development and implementation, and how they may influence decisions.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3

**Comment:** There is scattered reference to DACs and how the IRWMP could affect them. Exhibit D of the application provides the information required to address the presence, participation, and benefit to DACs.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 1

**Comment:** The application does not identify any existing local planning documents and does not discuss any of the plans that would be collected as a foundation for the IRWMP. The dynamics of how these documents would be integrated is not discussed in the work plan.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 2

**Comment:** The work plan is based on establishment of "*regional water collaborative*". The collaborative members are not discussed in detail, but mentioned in general to be nearby water and utility companies and agencies and stakeholders. Meeting participants are mentioned in Attachment D but are not listed in the work plan and none are mentioned to have committed to be participants of the water collaborative except the few that submitted letters of support. This should have been mentioned in the work plan or application.

**TOTAL SCORE: 25**